

Message

---

**From:** Strynar, Mark [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5A9910D5B38E471497BD875FD329A20A-STRYNAR, MARK]  
**Sent:** 6/6/2018 2:32:43 PM  
**To:** Shoemaker, Jody [shoemaker.jody@epa.gov]; Sivertsen, Scott [Sivertsen.Scott@epa.gov]; Washington, John [Washington.John@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** test of HLB vs WAX in PFAS capture  
**Attachments:** MJS Wax vs HLB SPE capture.pptx; 6-5-18 HLB vs WAX PFAS check.xlsx

All,

I ran this experiment last week to check which analytes are captured when I stack HLB followed by WAX, and then Wax followed by HLB. See the attachments if you are interested. I did not quantitate, just check which cartridge captured the analyte when stacked.

A few things that differ from Method 537 was I processed 500 mL of nitric acid spiked and filtered surface water (in duplicate) and do not use Trizma. I also do not do the 7.5 mL (2X) water rinse of the HLB cartridge before methanol elution. The elution of the WAX SPE follows our usual procedures. I did not try to capture PFOSA as it comes out in the neutral wash, however I have done this before with WAX and know it is there.

In brief here is what we found.

## Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Mark

Dr. Mark J. Strynar  
Physical Scientist  
US EPA  
National Exposure Research Laboratory  
919-541-3706  
Strynar.mark@epa.gov